CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

APPLICATION NUMBER:
22-266

ADMINISTRATIVE and CORRESPONDENCE DOCUMENTS
EXCLUSIVITY SUMMARY

NDA # 22-266          SUPPL #          HFD # 170

Trade Name  Onsolis

Generic Name  fentanyl buccal soluble film

Applicant Name  Biond delivery Sciences International (BDSI)

Approval Date (If Known): PDUFA date was 6-12-09, now overdue, Action date unknown at this time.

PART I  IS AN EXCLUSIVITY DETERMINATION NEEDED?

1. An exclusivity determination will be made for all original applications, and all efficacy supplements. Complete PARTS II and III of this Exclusivity Summary only if you answer "yes" to one or more of the following questions about the submission.

   a) Is it a 505(b)(1), 505(b)(2) or efficacy supplement?  
      YES ☑  NO ☐

   If yes, what type? Specify 505(b)(1), 505(b)(2), SE1, SE2, SE3,SE4, SE5, SE6, SE7, SE8 505(b)(2)

   c) Did it require the review of clinical data other than to support a safety claim or change in labeling related to safety? (If it required review only of bioavailability or bioequivalence data, answer "no."  )
      YES ☑  NO ☐

   If your answer is "no" because you believe the study is a bioavailability study and, therefore, not eligible for exclusivity, EXPLAIN why it is a bioavailability study, including your reasons for disagreeing with any arguments made by the applicant that the study was not simply a bioavailability study.

   If it is a supplement requiring the review of clinical data but it is not an effectiveness supplement, describe the change or claim that is supported by the clinical data:

   d) Did the applicant request exclusivity?  
      YES ☑  NO ☐

   If the answer to (d) is "yes," how many years of exclusivity did the applicant request?
      3
e) Has pediatric exclusivity been granted for this Active Moiety?

   YES ☒  NO ☐

If the answer to the above question in YES, is this approval a result of the studies submitted in response to the Pediatric Written Request? No.

Pediatric exclusivity was previously granted for the fentanyl moiety to Alza Corporation for N 19-813 for Duragesic when they fulfilled their PWR. Their pediatric exclusivity expired on November 20, 2006.

Cephalon is the sponsor of another product sharing the fentanyl active moiety (Actiq, N 20-747) and they too previously submitted their response to a PWR, but, at the determination of the Pediatric Exclusivity Board, it was determined that Pediatric Exclusivity for that product would be denied (see separate memo in DFS from Debbie Avant).

This NDA is for a different product (Onsolis) than both of the other products mentioned above that share the same active moiety. This NDA does NOT contain a response to a PWR.

IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED "NO" TO ALL OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS, GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS AT THE END OF THIS DOCUMENT.

2. Is this drug product or indication a DESI upgrade?

   YES ☐  NO ☒

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 2 IS "YES," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 8 (even if a study was required for the upgrade).

PART II  FIVE-YEAR EXCLUSIVITY FOR NEW CHEMICAL ENTITIES
(Answer either #1 or #2 as appropriate)

1. Single active ingredient product.

Has FDA previously approved under section 505 of the Act any drug product containing the same active moiety as the drug under consideration? Answer "yes" if the active moiety (including other esterified forms, salts, complexes, chelates or clathrates) has been previously approved, but this particular form of the active moiety, e.g., this particular ester or salt (including salts with hydrogen or coordination bonding) or other non-covalent derivative (such as a complex, chelate, or clathrate) has not been approved. Answer "no" if the compound requires metabolic conversion (other than deesterification of an esterified form of the drug) to produce an already approved active moiety.

   YES ☒  NO ☐
If "yes," identify the approved drug product(s) containing the active moiety, and, if known, the NDA #(s).

NDA# 19-813 Duragesic
NDA# 20-747 Actiq
NDA# 21-947 Fentora
NDA# 21-338 Ionsys

2. Combination product.

If the product contains more than one active moiety (as defined in Part II, #1), has FDA previously approved an application under section 505 containing any one of the active moieties in the drug product? If, for example, the combination contains one never-before-approved active moiety and one previously approved active moiety, answer "yes." (An active moiety that is marketed under an OTC monograph, but that was never approved under an NDA, is considered not previously approved.)

N/A   YES   NO

If "yes," identify the approved drug product(s) containing the active moiety, and, if known, the NDA #(s).

NDA#
NDA#
NDA#

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 1 OR 2 UNDER PART II IS "NO," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 8. (Caution: The questions in part II of the summary should only be answered "NO" for original approvals of new molecular entities.) IF "YES," GO TO PART III.

PART III  THREE-YEAR EXCLUSIVITY FOR NDAs AND SUPPLEMENTS

To qualify for three years of exclusivity, an application or supplement must contain "reports of new clinical investigations (other than bioavailability studies) essential to the approval of the application and conducted or sponsored by the applicant." This section should be completed only if the answer to PART II, Question 1 or 2 was "yes."

1. Does the application contain reports of clinical investigations? (The Agency interprets "clinical investigations" to mean investigations conducted on humans other than bioavailability studies.) If the application contains clinical investigations only by virtue of a right of reference to clinical investigations in
another application, answer "yes," then skip to question 3(a). If the answer to 3(a) is "yes" for any investigation referred to in another application, do not complete remainder of summary for that investigation.

YES ☒ NO ☐

IF "NO," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 8.

2. A clinical investigation is "essential to the approval" if the Agency could not have approved the application or supplement without relying on that investigation. Thus, the investigation is not essential to the approval if 1) no clinical investigation is necessary to support the supplement or application in light of previously approved applications (i.e., information other than clinical trials, such as bioavailability data, would be sufficient to provide a basis for approval as an ANDA or 505(b)(2) application because of what is already known about a previously approved product), or 2) there are published reports of studies (other than those conducted or sponsored by the applicant) or other publicly available data that independently would have been sufficient to support approval of the application, without reference to the clinical investigation submitted in the application.

(a) In light of previously approved applications, is a clinical investigation (either conducted by the applicant or available from some other source, including the published literature) necessary to support approval of the application or supplement?

YES ☒ NO ☐

If "no," state the basis for your conclusion that a clinical trial is not necessary for approval AND GO DIRECTLY TO SIGNATURE BLOCK ON PAGE 8:

(b) Did the applicant submit a list of published studies relevant to the safety and effectiveness of this drug product and a statement that the publicly available data would not independently support approval of the application?

YES ☐ NO ☒

(1) If the answer to 2(b) is "yes," do you personally know of any reason to disagree with the applicant's conclusion? If not applicable, answer NO.

YES ☐ NO ☒

If yes, explain:

(2) If the answer to 2(b) is "no," are you aware of published studies not conducted or sponsored by the applicant or other publicly available data that could independently demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of this drug product?

YES ☐ NO ☒

If yes, explain:
(c) If the answers to (b)(1) and (b)(2) were both "no," identify the clinical investigations submitted in the application that are essential to the approval:

1. FEN-201: A Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Evaluation of the Efficacy, Safety and Tolerability of BEMA™ Fentanyl in the Treatment of Breakthrough Pain in Cancer Subjects; and

2. FEN-202: An Open Label, Long-Term Treatment Evaluation of the Safety of BEMA™ Fentanyl Use for Breakthrough Pain in Cancer Subjects on Chronic Opioid Therapy.

Studies comparing two products with the same ingredient(s) are considered to be bioavailability studies for the purpose of this section.

3. In addition to being essential, investigations must be "new" to support exclusivity. The agency interprets "new clinical investigation" to mean an investigation that 1) has not been relied on by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness of a previously approved drug for any indication and 2) does not duplicate the results of another investigation that was relied on by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness of a previously approved drug product, i.e., does not redemonstrate something the agency considers to have been demonstrated in an already approved application.

   a) For each investigation identified as "essential to the approval," has the investigation been relied on by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness of a previously approved drug product? (If the investigation was relied on only to support the safety of a previously approved drug, answer "no.")

   Investigation #1
   YES ☐   NO ☒

   Investigation #2
   YES ☐   NO ☒

   If you have answered "yes" for one or more investigations, identify each such investigation and the NDA in which each was relied upon:

   b) For each investigation identified as "essential to the approval", does the investigation duplicate the results of another investigation that was relied on by the agency to support the effectiveness of a previously approved drug product?

   Investigation #1
   YES ☐   NO ☒

   Investigation #2
   YES ☐   NO ☒

   If you have answered "yes" for one or more investigation, identify the NDA in which a similar investigation was relied on:
c) If the answers to 3(a) and 3(b) are no, identify each "new" investigation in the application or supplement that is essential to the approval (i.e., the investigations listed in #2(c), less any that are not "new"):

1. FEN-201: A Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Evaluation of the Efficacy, Safety and Tolerability of BEMA™ Fentanyl in the Treatment of Breakthrough Pain in Cancer Subjects; and

2. FEN-202: An Open Label, Long-Term Treatment Evaluation of the Safety of BEMA™ Fentanyl Use for Breakthrough Pain in Cancer Subjects on Chronic Opioid Therapy.

4. To be eligible for exclusivity, a new investigation that is essential to approval must also have been conducted or sponsored by the applicant. An investigation was "conducted or sponsored by" the applicant if, before or during the conduct of the investigation, 1) the applicant was the sponsor of the IND named in the form FDA 1571 filed with the Agency, or 2) the applicant (or its predecessor in interest) provided substantial support for the study. Ordinarily, substantial support will mean providing 50 percent or more of the cost of the study.

a) For each investigation identified in response to question 3(c): if the investigation was carried out under an IND, was the applicant identified on the FDA 1571 as the sponsor?

Investigation #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IND # 62,864</th>
<th>YES ☒</th>
<th>NO ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigation #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IND # 62,864</th>
<th>YES ☒</th>
<th>NO ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) For each investigation not carried out under an IND or for which the applicant was not identified as the sponsor, did the applicant certify that it or the applicant's predecessor in interest provided substantial support for the study? N/A

Investigation #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES ☐</th>
<th>NO ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain:</td>
<td>Explain:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigation #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES ☐</th>
<th>NO ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain:</td>
<td>Explain:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Notwithstanding an answer of "yes" to (a) or (b), are there other reasons to believe that the applicant should not be credited with having "conducted or sponsored" the study? (Purchased studies may not be used as the basis for exclusivity. However, if all rights to the drug are purchased (not just studies on the drug), the applicant may be considered to have sponsored or conducted the studies sponsored or conducted by its predecessor in interest.)

If yes, explain:

YES ☐ NO ☒

Name of person completing form:  Kim Compton, with assistance from Ellen Fields, M.D., M.P.H.
Title: Project Manager and Medical Team Leader (respectively)
Date: 6-9-09

Name of Office/Division Director signing form:  Bob A. Rappaport, M.D.
Title: Division Director, DAARP

Form OGD-011347; Revised 05/10/2004; formatted 2/15/05
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

Bob Rappaport
6/24/2009 05:17:30 PM
PEDIATRIC PAGE
(Complete for all filed original applications and efficacy supplements)

NDA/BLA#: 22-266                      Supplement Number: ____                       NDA Supplement Type (e.g. SE5): ____
Division Name: DAARP                      PDUFA Goal Date: 6-12-09                       Stamp Date: 12/12/2008
Proprietary Name: Onsolis
Established/Generic Name: fentanyl buccal soluble film
Dosage Form: bioerodable mucoadhesive system
Applicant/Sponsor: BDSI

Indication(s) previously approved (please complete this question for supplements and Type 6 NDAs only):
(1) ____
(2) ____
(3) ____
(4) ____

Pediatric use for each pediatric subpopulation must be addressed for each indication covered by current application under review. A Pediatric Page must be completed for each indication.

Number of indications for this pending application(s): 1
(Attach a completed Pediatric Page for each indication in current application.)

Indication: Management of breakthrough pain in patients with cancer who are already receiving and who are tolerant to opioid therapy for their underlying persistent pain

Q1: Is this application in response to a PREA PMR? Yes □ Continue
No □ Please proceed to Question 2.

If Yes, NDA/BLA#: ____ Supplement #: ____ PMR #: ____

Does the division agree that this is a complete response to the PMR?
Yes □ Please proceed to Section D.
No □ Please proceed to Question 2 and complete the Pediatric Page, as applicable.

Q2: Does this application provide for (If yes, please check all categories that apply and proceed to the next question):
(a) NEW □ active ingredient(s) (includes new combination); □ indication(s); □ dosage form; □ dosing regimen; or □ route of administration?*
(b) □ No. PREA does not apply. Skip to signature block.

* Note for CDER: SE5, SE6, and SE7 submissions may also trigger PREA.

Q3: Does this indication have orphan designation?
□ Yes. PREA does not apply. Skip to signature block.
□ No. Please proceed to the next question.

Q4: Is there a full waiver for all pediatric age groups for this indication (check one)?
□ Yes: (Complete Section A.)
□ No: Please check all that apply:
□ Partial Waiver for selected pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections B)
□ Deferred for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections C)
□ Completed for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections D)
□ Appropriately Labeled for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections E)
□ Extrapolation in One or More Pediatric Age Groups (Complete Section F)

IF THERE ARE QUESTIONS, PLEASE CONTACT THE CDER PMHS VIA EMAIL (cederpms@fda.hhs.gov) OR AT 301-796-0700.